Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

The present application includes claims 1-25. Claims 1-25 were rejected in the
May 5, 2004 Office Action. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended.

Claims 1 and 21 are amended to recite retrieving from a PACS database, using a
PACS display workstation, raw image data, which has not been fully preprocessed
according to a predetermined subset of preprocessing functions applied to the raw image
data at an acquisition workstation, delivered from an imaging modality.

Claims 1 and 21 are also amended to recite selecting from a PACS database,
using the PACS display workstation, a first preprocessing function for the raw image
data, which has not been fully preprocessed according to said predetermined subset of
preprocessing functions applied at said acquisition workstation, delivered from the
imaging modality, where the first preprocessing function is stored in the PACS database,
the first preprocessing function differing from the predetermined subset of preprocessing
functions applied to the raw image data at the acquisition workstation.

Claims 1, 11 and 21 are also amended to recite processing the raw image data,
which has not been fully preprocessed according to the predetermined subset of
preprocessing functions applied at the acquisition workstation, at the PACS display
workstation by applying the first preprocessing function to the raw image data to create
resultant image data.

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

Claim 11 is also amended to recite retrieving from a PACS database raw image data, which has not been fully preprocessed according to a predetermined subset of preprocessing functions applied to the raw image data at an acquisition workstation, delivered from an imaging modality.

Claim 11 is also amended to recite selecting from a PACS database a first preprocessing function for the raw image data, which has not been fully preprocessed according to the predetermined subset of preprocessing functions applied at the acquisition workstation, delivered from the imaging modality, where the first preprocessing function is stored in the PACS database and the first preprocessing function differs from the predetermined subset of preprocessing functions.

Claim 21 is also amended to recite retrieving from a PACS database raw image data, which has not been fully preprocessed according to a predetermined subset of preprocessing functions applied to the raw image data at an acquisition workstation, delivered from an imaging modality, where the first preprocessing function is stored in said PACS database and the first preprocessing function differs from the predetermined subset of preprocessing functions.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

Claims 1, 8-9, 11, 12 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang, "PACS Basic Principles and Applications."

Claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Takeo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6, 231,246).

Claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Takeo, further in view of Vuylsteke (U.S. Patent No. 5,644,662).

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Wofford (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,003).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

The Applicant first turns to the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 11 and 21. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims 1, 11 and 21, and corresponding dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-25 comply with the written description requirement as the claims contain subject matter described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 are clearly

Page 14 of 22

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

supported throughout the specification, including for example, page 3, lines 25-28 to

page 4, line 1 and page 5, lines 8-19.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 satisfy the written

description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicant next turns to the rejection of claims 1, 8-9, 11, 12 and 19-21 under

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang. As set forth in previous Amendments,

Huang discloses a picture archiving and communication system ("PACS") that consists

of image and data acquisition, a PACS controller and archive and display subsystems

(Huang, Ch. 7.1). The image and data are generated by an imaging modality (Huang, Ch.

8.2). An acquisition gateway computer acquires the image and data from the imaging

modality (Huang, Ch. 8.2). The display subsystems display the received images (Huang,

Table 7.2). Huang also describes the generation and storage of a lookup table into an

image header of image data at an acquisition gateway computer and then the application

of the same lookup table at a workstation at the time of display (Huang, Ch. 8.7.1.4).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "the raw

image data [of Huang] is considered as not haven been fully preprocessed according to a

predetermined set of preprocessing functions, since it is only partially preprocessed . . .

and is sent to the workstation for further preprocessing . . ." (May 3, 2004 Final Office

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

Action, page 4). In addition, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's

assertion that Huang teaches the further preprocessing of the image data at the

workstation by applying lookup tables at the time of display, which occurs at the

workstations (May 3, 2004 Final Office Action, page 5).

As set forth above, Huang merely describes the processing of image data by 1)

storing a lookup table in the image data at an acquisition gateway computer and 2)

applying the same lookup table at the time of display of the image data at a

workstation. Huang therefore cannot and does not teach any system or method whereby

raw image data is received by an acquisition computer, the acquisition computer applies a

subset of preprocessing functions to the raw image data, and a workstation then processes

the same image data by applying a different preprocessing function to the image data, as

recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Huang

cannot teach elements of the claimed invention.

The present rejection encompasses 1, 8-9, 11, 12 and 19-21. Claims 1, 11 and 21

have been amended to clearly recite limitations previously submitted as not taught by

Huang. Claims 8-9, 12 and 19-20 depend from claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8-9, 11, 12 and 19-21 should be allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

The Applicant next turns to the rejection of claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 22 and 23

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Takeo. Takeo describes

a method and apparatus for reproducing an image via two image reproducing devices

wherein gradation and/or sharpness correction is performed for both images reproducing

devices.

However, Takeo does not overcome the shortcomings of Huang, as described

above. Specifically, Takeo does not teach the application of a subset of preprocessing

functions at an acquisition gateway computer, followed by the application of a different

preprocessing function at a workstation, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Takeo instead

describes the complete and full processing of image data at an image processing means

for two differing outputs (namely, a CRT display device and a laser printer) before

sending the fully processed image data to the display device (for display) and to the laser

printer (for reproduction) (col. 6, lines 32-49). In this way, Takeo merely describes the

application of all processing functions at a single location, namely the image processing

means 1 of FIG. 1 (col. 6, lines 37-41). Takeo is therefore incapable of teaching or

suggesting the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to image data at an

acquisition computer followed by the application of a different preprocessing function at

a display workstation, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Thus, the Applicant respectfully

submits that Takeo also fails to teach or suggest elements of the present claims.

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

Moreover, a combination of Huang and Takeo would similarly fail to teach or suggest elements of the present claims. As described above, neither Huang nor Takeo teach or suggest the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to image data at an acquisition computer followed by the application of a different preprocessing function at a display workstation, as described in claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Huang and Takeo does not teach or suggest elements of the present claims.

The present rejection encompasses claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 22 and 23. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to more clearly recite limitations previously submitted as not taught or suggested by Huang or Takeo, alone or in combination. Claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 22 and 23 depend from claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 22 and 23 should be allowable.

The Applicant next turns to the rejection of claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Takeo, further in view of Vuylsteke. Vulysteke describes multiple processing of radiographic images based on a pyramidal image decomposition.

However, Vulysteke does not overcome the shortcomings of either Huang or Takeo, as described above. Specifically, as stated in the January 30, 2004 Amendment, Vulysteke merely describes the iterative decomposition of an image into multiple levels

Page 18 of 22

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

of lower resolution, the processing of the image, then applying the inverse of the

transform that decomposed the original image (col. 3, lines 1-22, 52-68; col. 4, lines 1-

12). Vulysteke does not describe any additional processing of the image data other than

the singular processing that occurs after the image has been iteratively decomposed (col.

3, lines 1-22, 52-68; col. 4, lines 1-12). Therefore, Vulysteke is incapable of teaching or

suggesting the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to image data at an

acquisition computer and a different preprocessing function applied to the image data at a

display workstation, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Thus, the Applicant respectfully

submits that Vulysteke also fails to teach or suggest elements of the present claims.

Moreover, a combination of Huang, Takeo and Vulysteke similarly fails to teach

or suggest elements of the present claims. As described above, none of Huang, Takeo

and Vulysteke teach or suggest the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to

image data at an acquisition computer followed by the application of a different

preprocessing function at a display workstation, as described in claims 1, 11 and 21.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Huang, Takeo and

Vulysteke does not teach or suggest elements of the present claims.

The present rejection encompasses claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 24 and 25. Claims 1, 11

and 21 have been amended to more clearly recite limitations previously submitted as not

taught or suggested by Huang, Takeo or Vulysteke, alone or in combination. Claims 5, 7,

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

16, 18, 24 and 25 depend from claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 24 and 25 should be allowable.

The Applicant next turns to the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Wofford. Wofford describes a method for maximizing fidelity and dynamic range for a region of interest ("ROI") within digitized medical image display. However, Wofford does not overcome the shortcomings of Huang, as described above. Specifically, the entire invention of Wofford, including all processing of data, occurs at a display workstation (col. 4, lines 53-61). In this way, as no processing occurs at an acquisition gateway computer, Wofford is therefore incapable of describing the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to image data at an acquisition computer and a different preprocessing function to the image data at a display workstation, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Wofford is incapable of teaching or suggesting elements of the claimed invention.

Moreover, a combination of Wofford and Huang similarly fails to teach or suggest elements of the present claims. As described above, neither of Huang and Wofford teach or suggest the application of a subset of preprocessing functions to image data at an acquisition computer followed by the application of a different preprocessing function at a display workstation, as described in claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant

Page 20 of 22

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

respectfully submits that a combination of Wofford and Huang does not teach or suggest

elements of the present claims.

The present rejection encompasses claim 10. Claim 1 has been amended to more

clearly recite limitations previously submitted as not taught or suggested by Huang or

Wofford, alone or in combination. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Therefore, the

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 should be allowable.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present

application should be allowable over the prior art.

Application No. 09/473,003
Attorney Docket No. 15-IS-5283
Amendment dated June 24, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of May 3, 2004

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the

Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any

overpayment to the Deposit Account of GTC, Account No. 07-0845.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____ June 24, 2004 _____

Christopher R. Carroll

Christopher R. Carroll
Registration No. 52,700

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100